GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

No. 160] CHANDIGARH MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2025 (KARTIKA 26, 1947 SAKA)

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Notification

The 14th November, 2025

No. 204 Genl./XVII.3(6-G).—It is hereby notified for general information that the days enumerated in the schedule below shall be observed as Holidays by this Court during the **Year 2026**:-

SCHEDULE

S. No.	NAME OF THE HOLIDAY	MONTH	DATE	DAY	No. of Holidays
1.	All Sundays	---	---	---	52
2.	2nd & 4th Saturdays	---	---	---	24
3.	Republic Day	January	26	Monday	1
4.	Guru Ravi Dass Jayanti	February	01	**Sunday**	--
5.	Maha Shivratri	February	15	**Sunday**	--
6.	Holi	March	03	Tuesday	1
7.	Hola	March	04	Wednesday	1
8.	Id-u'l-Fitr	March	21	Saturday	1
9.	Ram Navami	March	26	Thursday	1
10.	Mahavir Jayanti	March	31	Tuesday	1
11.	Good Friday	April	03	Friday	1
12.	Baisakhi / Dr. Ambedkar's Jayanti	April	14	Tuesday	1

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by SURESH BALA
Date: 2025.11.17 16:18:48 IST
Reason: Published
Location:

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

13.	Id-ul-Zuha (Bakrid)	May	28	Thursday	1
14.	Martyrdom Day of Sri Guru Arjan Dev Ji	June	18	Thursday	1
15.	Independence Day	August	15	Saturday	1
16.	Raksha Bandhan	August	28	Friday	1
17.	Sri Krishan Janmashtami	September	04	Friday	1
18.	Mahatma Gandhi's Jayanti	October	02	Friday	1
19.	Dussehra	October	20	Tuesday	1
20.	Maharishi Valmiki Jayanti	October	26	Monday	1
21.	Diwali	November	08	**Sunday**	--
22.	Birthday of Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji	November	24	Tuesday	1
23.	Martyrdom Day of Sri Guru Teg Bahadur Ji	December	14	Monday	1
24.	Christmas	December	25	Friday	1
25.	Jor Mela Fatehgarh Sahib	December	26	**Saturday**	--
26.	Jor Mela Fatehgarh Sahib	December	27	**Sunday**	--
27.	Jor Mela Fatehgarh Sahib	December	28	Monday	1

The High Court shall remain closed for Summer Vacation from 1st June to 30th June, 2026 (both days inclusive) and for Winter break from 25th December to 31st December, 2026 (both days inclusive).

The High Court shall also remain closed for Dussehra break from 19th October to 26th October, 2026 (both days inclusive) and for Diwali break from 6th November to 10th November, 2026 (both days inclusive).

Local Holidays shall be observed on 1st, 2nd, 5th, 6th & 7th January, 2026 on account of New Year break, 2nd March, 2026 on account of Holi break, 13th & 15th April, 2026 on account of Baisakhi break, 19th, 21st to 23rd October 2026 on account of Dussehra break, 29th October on account of Karwa Chauth and 6th, 7th, 9th & 10th November 2026 on account of Diwali break, 29th to 31st December, 2026 on account of Winter break.

All Saturdays are non-Court working days except 31.01.2026, 07.03.2026, 18.04.2026, 01.08.2026, 31.10.2026, 21.11.2026 and 05.12.2026 which shall be Court working days.

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND JUDGES

(Sd.) . . .,

Assistant Registrar (General)
for Registrar General

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Notification

The 14th November, 2025

No. 205 Genl./XVII.3(6-G).—By virtue of provisions of Section 47 of the Punjab Courts Act (VI of 1918) as amended from time to time, read with the Punjab Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions Act, 1964, it is hereby notified for general information that the dates enumerated in the Schedule below shall be observed as **holidays during the Calendar Year 2026** by all the Subordinate Courts in the **States of Punjab, Haryana and UT, Chandigarh :-**

SCHEDULE

S.No.	NAME OF THE HOLIDAY	MONTH	DATE	DAY	No. of holidays
1.	All Sundays	---	---	---	52
2.	2nd & 4th Saturdays	---	---	---	24
3.	New Year Day	January	01	Thursday	1
4.	Republic Day	January	26	Monday	1
5.	Guru Ravi Dass Jayanti	February	01	Sunday	--
6.	Maha Shivratri	February	15	Sunday	--
7.	Holi	March	03	Tuesday	1
8.	Hola	March	04	Wednesday	1
9.	Id-u'l-Fitr	March	21	Saturday	1
10.	Ram Navami	March	26	Thursday	1
11.	Mahavir Jayanti	March	31	Tuesday	1
12.	Baisakhi / Dr. Ambedkar's Jayanti	April	14	Tuesday	1
13.	Id-ul-Zuha (Bakrid)	May	28	Thursday	1
14.	Martyrdom Day of Sri Guru Arjan Dev Ji	June	18	Thursday	1
15.	Independence Day	August	15	Saturday	1
16.	Sri Krishan Janmashtami	September	04	Friday	1
17.	Mahatma Gandhi's Jayanti	October	02	Friday	1

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

18.	Dussehra	October	20	Tuesday	1
19.	Maharishi Valmiki Jayanti	October	26	Monday	1
20.	Diwali	November	08	Sunday	--
21.	Vishwakarma Day	November	09	Monday	1
22.	Birthday of Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji	November	24	Tuesday	1
23.	Martyrdom Day of Sri Guru Teg Bahadur Ji	December	14	Monday	1
24.	Christmas	December	25	Friday	1
25.	Winter Spell	December	26-31	Saturday to Thursday	6

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND JUDGES

(Sd.) . . .,

Assistant Registrar (General)
for Registrar General

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 12th November, 2025

No. 566695-HII(2)-2025/17844 .— In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **67/2023 dated 30.09.2025** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between:

SURINDER PAL SINGH S/O LATE AJIB SINGH, H.NO. 551, VILLAGE MATOUR, SECTOR 70, MOHALI (PB.). (WORKMAN)

AND

M/S DESH SEWAK PRINTERS LTD., SECTOR 29-D, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS GENERAL MANAGER. (MANAGEMENT)

AWARD

1. Workman Surinder Pal Singh has presented the Industrial Dispute in hand under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (here-in-after in short called 'ID Act').

2. Briefly stated, the workman was appointed by the respondent-management as Trainee Computer Operator on 26.09.2005 on a consolidated wage of ` 3,104/- vide letter No.202 dated 26.09.2005. Thereafter, he was appointed as Sub-Editor-cum-DTP Operator vide letter dated 18.02.2013. The workman remained in uninterrupted employment up to 30.05.2020 when his services were illegally and wrongly terminated by the management. At the time of termination, he was drawing ` 12,500/- per month as wages. The workman received two letters bearing No.DS/176/2020 dated 11.02.2020 on the subject 'illegal strike since 24th January, 2020 – Show Cause Notice' and letter No.DS/188/2020 dated 19.02.2020on the subject 'Show cause notice for absence from duty', to which he replied to the satisfaction of the management. On 01.06.2020, he went to attend his normal duty but he was refused work by the management on the pretext that he should withdrew himself from the list of workers who authorised the Union to serve upon the management a demand notice dated 05.01.2020. The workman refused to sign the paper and thereafter the management refused work without assigning any reason and notice. The workman served upon the respondent-management a demand notice dated 24.04.2023. The respondent-management neither replied to the demand notice nor took him back to the duty. The Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer was requested for his intervention but no settlement could be made possible within the stipulated period. The action in terminating the services of the workman is illegal, wrong, motivated, against the principles of natural justice and amounts to unfair labour practice. It is prayed that he may be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages and without any change in service conditions. It is stated that he remained unemployed during the period i.e. from the date of termination till date. Hence, the claim statement.

3. The respondent-management filed reply to the claim statement raising preliminary objections inter alia on the ground that the claim statement is nothing but an abuse of process of law. It is submitted that on 24.01.2020, the workman left his work to indulge himself in an unlawful strike, devoid of any

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

discernible agenda, incited by an individual Ashok Kumar – Co-worker. The said action was very aggressive and with a sole intention to deliberately inflict harm upon the organisation and to pressurize the respondent-management to withdraw the inquiry / disciplinary proceedings to be conducted on serious allegations against Ashok Kumar and Surjit Singh. Despite numerous written and verbal requests extended to workman, urging his prompt return to work, they persisted in their refusal to do so. The workman along with other workers, obstructed the main gate creating a situation of intimidation where anyone attempting to enter would be met with repercussions. In order to address that issue promptly, the matter was formally reported to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh vide letter dated 25.01.2020 with a copy of the same to the S.H.O., Industrial Area, Phase – I, Chandigarh. The said incident was also formally reported to the Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh, who further marked it to Assistant Labour Commissioner, seeking immediate intervention. The said communication was documented vide Diary No.PA/DC 27.01.2020. It is submitted that a show-cause notice was issued to the workman on 11.02.2020 through registered post to show cause within one week of receipt of letter as to why his services should not be terminated for having indulged in misconduct, breach of contract of employment, breach of discipline and for causing incalculable losses. The workman chose not to file reply and voluntarily abandoned the service by remaining absent without any intimation, explanation or authorization. It is submitted that the workman continuously remained absent without authorization and a show-cause notice was again issued on 19.02.2020 vide letter No.DS/188/2020 for his un-authorised absence from duty. The said show-cause notice was issued through registered post granting him another opportunity to submit his explanation and to come present in the office of AGM, Desh Sewak on 24.02.2020 but the workman did not pay any heed and continued to abscond and abandoning his duty. The respondent-management kept waiting for the workman to show-up for considerable long period of time for any responsible and interested employee to join back but the workman never came back and filed the present claim statement. A prayer was made for dismissal of the claim of the workman.

4. The workman filed rejoinder wherein he denied the averments made in the written reply and submitted that there was no strike on 24.01.2020 as there was no demand of the workers. It is submitted that Ashok Kumar is a co-worker and also a President of the Union. When there was no dispute with the management then why he will instigate the workers to go on strike. It is denied for want of knowledge that there were serious allegations against Ashok Kumar and Surjit Singh and the management wrote letters to Senior Superintendent of Police, S.H.O. Industrial Area, Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh and Assistant Labour Commissioner, U.T. Chandigarh. It is submitted that letters dated 11.02.2020 and 19.02.2020 were never received by the workman. He was refused work on 25.01.2020 when he went to attend his normal duty. The management asked the workman to withdraw himself from the list of workers who has authorised the Union to serve upon the management a demand notice for increase in wages to ` 25,000/- per month. The work was verbally refused to workman on 25.01.2020. A prayer was made for allowing the claim statement.

5. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 09.04.2024 :-

1. Whether the termination of services of the workman is illegal, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to ? OPW
2. Relief.

6. Thereafter, both the parties were called upon to lead their respective evidence.

7. In evidence of the workman, workman himself appeared as AW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A'. He also tendered into evidence documents:-

Copy of appointment letter dated 6.09.2005 issued to the workman as Training Computer Operator	**Exhibit 'W1'**

Copy of appointment letter dated 18.02.2013 issued to the workman as Sub-Editor-cum-DTP Operator	**Exhibit 'W2'**

Thereafter, the Learned Representative for the workman closed the evidence on behalf of the workman.

8. In evidence of the management, Chetan Sharma – General Manager, Desh Sewak Newspaper appeared as MW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A'. He also tendered into evidence photocopies of documents:-

Complaint dated 25.01.2020	**Exhibit 'M1'**
Copy of complaint dated 25.01.2020 to Labour Commissioner, Chandigarh	**Exhibit 'M2'**
Photographs (9 in number)	**Exhibit 'M3' to Exhibit 'M11'**
Letter dated 11.02.2020 addressed from Personal Manager, Sukhwinder Singh to Workman Surinder Pal Singh, relating to the subject of illegal strike since 24.01.2020 – show cause notice on the letter pad of Desh Sewak Daily	**Exhibit 'M12'**
Copy of postal receipt dated 12.02.2020	**Exhibit 'M12/1'**
Letter dated 19.02.2020 addressed from Personnel Officer, Sukhwinder Singh to Workman Surinder Pal Singh, relating to the subject of show cause notice for absence from duty on the letter pad of Desh Sewak Daily	**Exhibit 'M13'**
Copy of postal receipt dated 19.02.2020	**Exhibit 'M13/1'**
Letter dated 20.05.2020 addressed from Personnel Officer, Sukhwinder Singh to Workman Surinder Pal Singh, relating to the subject striking off his name from the rolls of the company owing to his illegal strike and also for his prolonged abandonment of duty on the letter pad of Desh Sewak Daily	**Exhibit 'M14'**
Copy of postal receipt dated 20.05.2020	**Exhibit 'M14/1'**
Pen-drive containing the video recording of strike	**Exhibit 'MO-X'**

9. The management also examined Umed Kumar as MW2, who tendered in his evidence, his affidavit Exhibit 'MW2/A'. Ram Pal Singh appeared as MW3 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW3/A'. Thereafter, the Learned Representative for the management closed the evidence on behalf of the management.

10. I have heard the arguments addressed by Learned Representatives for the parties and gone through the case file carefully with their able assistance. My issue-wise findings are as under:-

Issue No. 1

11. The workman is required to prove the said issue.

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

12. Learned Representative for the workman submitted that the workman had rendered his services to the respondent-management honestly and un-interruptedly up to 30.05.2020. The respondent-management has illegally terminated the services. He prayed that the workman is entitled for reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

13. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management submitted that the workman had voluntarily abandoned the services without any intimation or explanation and he did not comeforward to resume his services despite issuance of show cause notice. He prayed that the workman is not entitled to any relief as prayed for, by him.

14. However, before coming to any logical conclusion, it is necessary to discuss the evidence led by both the parties.

15. The workman while appearing as AW1 deposed that he was appointed by the respondent-management as Trainee Computer Operator on 26.09.2005 on a consolidated wages of ` 3,104/- and subsequently he was given appointment of Sub-Editor-cum-DTP Operator vide letter dated 18.02.2013. He deposed that he remained in un-interrupted employment up to 30.05.2020. He further testified that his services were illegally & wrongly terminated by the management vide letter No.DS/2020/226 dated 20.05.2020 and at that time he was drawing ` 12,500/- per month. The workman deposed that he received the letter No.DS/176/2020 dated 11.02.2020 and letter No.DS/188/2020 dated 19.02.2020 on the alleged charges of absence from duty to which he replied to the satisfaction of the management. He deposed that on 01.06.2020, he went to attend his duty, he along with other workers were refused work by the respondent-management on the pretext that he should withdrawhimself from the list of workers who had authorised the Union to serve upon the management a demand notice dated 05.01.2020. He deposed that when he refused to sign the paper,the management refused him work without assigning any reason or notice. The workman further testified that he was neither issued any charge sheet nor any inquiry was held and he was not even paid retrenchment compensation at the time of termination. He further stated that the respondent-management has illegally withheld the wages of all the employees for the month of January, 2020. He also served a demand notice dated 24.04.2023 upon the management. The management neither replied the same nor took him back on duty. The Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh was requested for his intervention but no settlement could be made possible within stipulated period.

16. On the other hand, Chetan Sharma – General Manager while stepping in to the witness box as MW1 deposed that he was the General Manager / Resident Editor of Desh Sewak since the year 2018. He deposed that on 24.01.2020, the workman left his work and indulged himself in an un-lawful strike, devoid of any discernible agenda and the said strike was incited by co-worker Ashok Kumar with a sole intention to inflict harm upon the organization and to pressurise the respondent-management to withdraw the inquiry / disciplinary proceedings to be conducted on serious allegations against Ashok Kumar and Surjit Singh. Despite numerous written and verbal requests extended to the workman, urging their prompt return to work, the workman along with other workers obstructed the main gate, created a situation of intimidation where anyone attempting to enter would be met with repercussions. He testified that inorder to address the issue, the matter was reported to Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh vide letter dated 25.01.2020. A copy of the same was also made to SHO, Industrial Area, Phase – I, Chandigarh and the matter was formally reported to the Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh seeking his intervention. He deposed that a show cause notice was issued to the workman on 11.02.2020 through registered post to show cause within one week from receipt of letter as to why his services should not be terminated for having indulged in misconduct, breach of contract of employment, breach of discipline and for causing incalculable losses. The workman willfully chose not to reply to the said notice and voluntarily abandoned his services without any intimation. He deposed that the workman continuously remained absent without any authorisation and another show

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

cause notice vide letter dated 19.02.2020 was issued to the workman for his un-authorised absence and granting him another opportunity to submit his explanation and to come present in the office on 24.02.2020 but the workman did not pay any heed to the said letter and continued to abscond from duty and abandoned his duty. An opportunity was awarded to him to show-up, for considerably long period of time for any responsible and interested employee to join back but he never returned and consequently, his name was struck off from the rolls of Desh Sewak vide letter dated 20.05.2020 issued by the Personnel Officer (authorised person).

17. MW2 Umed Kumar deposed that he was working as Accountant in the Desh Sewak. He was also the Cashier of the Union. He stated that on 24.01.2020, the workman left his work and participated in a strike. The goal of the strike was to put pressure on the management to drop the inquiry and disciplinary proceedings to be conducted against the Ashok Kumar and Surjit Singh, who were facing serious allegations.

18. MW3 Ram Pal deposed that he wascurrently Circulation Manager and also member of Desh Sewak Employees Union since its establishment. He deposed that the workman refused to return to work and due to illegal work stoppage by the workman and others workers,the management could not print the newspaper incurring huge losses and the printing had to be outsourced to the printing press of Indian Express at Panchkula, Haryana.

19. It transpires from the record that the workman was appointed as Trainee Computer Operator in Desh Sewak vide appointment letter dated 26.09.2005 on a consolidated monthly salary of ` 3,104/-. The workman has placed on record the appointment letter Exhibit 'W1'. The management has not disputed the said fact. Hence, the workman was appointed in the respondent-management as Trainee Computer Operator vide letter dated 26.09.2005.

20. It is the case of the workman himself that he was appointed as Sub-Editor-cum-DTP Operator vide letter dated 18.02.2013 (Exhibit 'W2'). This fact has also not been disputed by the management. The workman deposed that he remained in the uninterrupted employment of the respondent-management up to 30.05.2020 and his services were illegally & wrongfully terminated vide letter No.D5/2020/226 dated 20.05.2020 and at the time of termination, he was drawing a monthly wages of ` 12,500/-. On the other hand, MW1 has deposed that the workman has left his work on 24.01.2020 and indulged himself in anun-lawful strike, devoid of any discernible agenda and despite numerous requests extended to him to return to work, he refused to resume duty and the matter was reported to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Deputy Commissioner, SHO, Industrial Area, Phase – I, Chandigarh (Exhibit 'M1' & Exhibit 'M2'). MW1 had further deposed that the workman was issued show cause notice dated 11.02.2020 as well as dated 19.02.2020 vide registered post (Exhibit 'M12', Exhibit 'M12/1', Exhibit 'M13' & Exhibit 'M13/1') calling upon him to resume the duty but the workman did not pay any heed to the said show cause notices and continued to abscond from the duty. The workman while appearing as AW1 admitted that he received letters dated 11.02.2020 and 19.02.2020 on the alleged charge of absence from duty. He deposed vide his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' that he replied to the said letters to the satisfaction of the management which was duly received by the management. However, the management has denied that the claimant-workman had replied to the said show cause notices. During cross-examination, the workman stated that he had replied through registered post to the show cause notices dated 11.02.2020 and 19.02.2020. During cross-examination, he stated that he did not have copy of the reply. He further stated during his cross-examination that he can produce the copy of the postal receipts as the same were lying at home. However, the workman did not produce the postal receipts showing dispatch of reply to the show cause notices.

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

21. The respondent-management placed on record the copy of the show cause notice dated 11.02.2020 (Exhibit 'M12') as well as the copy of show cause notice 19.02.2020 (Exhibit 'M13'). The show cause notice (Exhibit 'M12') stipulates that the action of the workman in illegal strike constitutes breach of contract of employment apart from breach of discipline. It further stipulates that he was advised to show cause within one week of receipt of that letter as to why his services should not be terminated for having indulged in misconduct of observing illegal strike and having caused incalculable losses. The show cause notice dated 19.02.2020 (Exhibit 'M13') mentions that the workman was continuously absent from duty since 24.01.2020 and he was informed time and again that his absence was causing incalculable losses to the institution of Desh Sewak but no reply has been received by the respondent-management. The said show cause notice (Exhibit 'M13') further provides that the act of not being present on duty for a period of 26 days not only constituted willful negligence of duty but also a misconduct and it was also a voluntarily abandoning of service which was causing huge losses to the management. The absence from duty for such a long time without any prior application or notice or leave shows his disinterest in continuing service with the management. Vide show cause notice (Exhibit 'M13') he was given an opportunity of hearing to present himself before the AGM, Desh Sewak with detailed reply on 24.02.2020. It further mentions that it was last opportunity to submit his explanation, if any, and if he failed to turn up, the respondent-management was left with no alternative except to conclude that he was advertently absconding from the duty and his name will be struck off from the rolls of the Desh Sewak.

22. It transpires from the record that the respondent-management has denied the workman having filed reply to the show cause notices. Onus to prove that the workman replied to the said show cause notices laid heavily upon the workman. In his pleadings as well as affidavit, he submitted that he replied to the show cause notices for absence from duty. However, he failed to place on record the copy of the said replies stated to be have been furnished to the management. Even the postal receipts vide which he had stated to have dispatched the reply have not been placed on record despite availing opportunity by the workman. The workman in his claim statement as well as his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' had stated that he received the letter dated 11.02.2020 and 19.02.2020 on the alleged charge of absence from duty. However, in his replication he stated that the said letters were never received by him. Hence, all these facts have raised doubt regarding the veracity of the workman.

23. It is also the case of the workman that on 01.06.2020, he was refused work by the management when he went to attend normal duty. The workman deposed that he was terminated without assigning any reason for refusal and he was also not issued any notice at that time. However, the respondent had denied that the workman had showed up at the work place and he was denied the work by the management as averred by him. The workman has himself testified that the respondent-management had terminated his services vide letter dated 20.05.2020. MW1 during his cross-examination admitted that the services of the workman were terminated vide letter dated 20.05.2020 (Exhibit 'M14'). Perusal of the letter dated 20.05.2020 (Exhibit 'M14') shows that the same was addressed to the workman on the subject striking his name from the rolls of the Company owing to his illegal strike and also for his prolonged abandonment of duty. The said letter (Exhibit 'M14') clearly mentions that the workman had not responded to various communications sent to him including show cause notices though it was distinctly conveyed to him that it was last communication and if no reply was received from him, it will amount to willful absconding from duty and in such eventuality, the management will be left with no alternative except to struck off his name from rolls of the service register.

24. Learned Representative for the workman argued that the services of the workman were illegally terminated by the respondent-management. He argued that the workman had approached the respondent-management for work on 01.06.2020 but he was refused to resume service. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management argued that the workman had indulged in illegal strike and

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

despite issuance of show cause notices, the workman did not resume service. He argued that the workman has abandoned the services and he was also informed that in case of failure to resume service it would mean that he has voluntarily abandoned the services. He argued that since the workman has abandoned his services,no inquiry was required to be conducted before striking his name from the rolls of the management.

25. In the case in hand, admittedly the workman was issued two show cause notices calling him to resume his duty but he did not resume his service despite repeated calls made by the management. Once the show cause notices were received by the workman, he was duty bound to present himself before the management but he failed to show that he made any effort to resume his duty before issuance of letter dated 20.05.2024 (Exhibit 'M14'). The respondent-management has issued a final call vide letter (Exhibit 'M13') calling upon him to join his duty but the workman did not comeforward to resume duty and the aforesaid act of the workman is abandoning of service and the act of striking off the name of the workman from the rolls of the management is a consequential act as one cannot accept the employer to indefinitely wait for an employee to resume services. The workman has remained absent for approximately five months and his absence without any intimation and by ignoring the call letter of the respondent-management amounts to abandonment of services.

26. Reliance is placed upon the authority titled as ***Sukhdev Singh Versus Delhi Development Authority, LPA No.913/2011 decided by the Hon'ble Delhi High on November 8, 2011,*** wherein it was held, *"The rule that abandonment of employment is a misconduct and to be actionable, domestic inquiry is a must cannot be said to be of absolute nature."*

In ***VivekaNandSethiVersus Chairman, J & K Bank Ltd., (2005)5 SCC 337*** it was held that an employer can arrive at a satisfaction that the workman has no intention to join his duty and raise a legal fiction and which though is a wide import but once the action on the part of the employer is found to be fair, the onus is on the workman to prove to the contrary.

27. In the case in hand, long continuous un-authorised absence of the workman stands established. There is no evidence that the action on thepart of the respondent-management was not fair as the management had given reasonable opportunity to the workman to resume his duty but he chose not to resume his duty. The respondent-management, therefore, was left with no other option but to struck off his name from the rolls of the management.

In ***Vijay S. Sathaye Versus India Airlines Limited & Others,(2013)10 SSC 253*** it was held, *"It is a settled law that an employee cannot be termed as slave, he has right to abandon the service any time voluntarily by submitting his resignation and alternatively, not joining the duty and remaining absent for long. Absence from duty in the beginning may be a misconduct but when the absence is for a very long period, it may amount to voluntarily abandonment of service and in that eventuality, the bonds of service come to an end automatically without requiring any order to be passed by the employer."*

28. In the case in hand, the entire facts & circumstances in totality shows that the workman has abandoned his work at his own and his services were terminated for abandoning the work. The act of deletion of name of the workman from the rolls of the management was a consequential action and accordingly, the said issue stands decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

Relief -

29. In view of the aforesaid findings, the industrial dispute in hand stands declined. The workman is not entitled to any relief as prayed for by him. Appropriate Government be informed accordingly. File be consigned to records after due compliance.

(Sd.) . . .,

(MANISHA JAIN)
UID No. PB0158
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal &
Labour Court,
Union Territory Chandigarh.

Dated : The 30th September , 2025

Secretary Labour,
Chandigarh Administration.

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Rajesh War S/o Ram Kanwar Gupta, R/o House No. 1009, Sector 8-C, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Rajesh Ear to Rajeshwar Bansal.

[1912-1]

I, Nabi S/o Ali Hassan R/o H. No. 832, Sector 45-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Nabi to Mohd. Nabi.

[1913-1]

I, Naresh Kumari W/o Des Raj R/o # 409B, Sector 33-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Naresh.

[1914-1]

I, Kulwinder Singh S/o Gurbachan Singh R/o H. No. 1278, Sector 41-B, Chandigarh-160036, have changed my minor son's name from Rudra to Rounak.

[1915-1]

I, Manisha W/o Senter Pal # 4091, Maloya Colony Chandigarh, have changed my name to Munesh.

[1916-1]

I, Dharmender S/o Ram Asre # 636, Sector 45-B, Burail, Chandigarh, have changed my minor daughter's name from Mneesha to Vinisha.

[1917-1]

I, Rubina W/o Shahzad Alam R/o # 2874, Sector-56, Palsora, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Rubina Parvin.

[1918-1]

I, Dhruv Kumar S/o Sh. Bhim Lal Sharma R/o House No. 553, Sector 33-B, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Dhruv Kumar to Dil Parshad Dhakal.

[1919-1]

I, Bahadur Singh Sawant S/o Shri Laxman Singh R/o House No. 222, Sector 11-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Bahadur Singh Sawant to Bahadur Singh.

[1920-1]

I, Mohammad Sarfaraz Alam S/o Mumtaz Alam R/o # 1421-A, Sector 47-B, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Mohammad Sarfaraz Alam to MD Sarfaraz Alam.

[1921-1]

I, Asgar Ali S/o Habibulla Sabri R/o Backside Dargah Peer , Sector 29-C, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Asgar Ali to Asgar Sabri.

[1922-1]

I, Subhash Chander *alias* Subhash Chander Bharti alias Subhash C.A. Bharti alias Subhash Chander Azad Bharti S/o Prem Dass R/o 850/1, Sector 40-A, Chandigarh-160036, have changed my name to Subhash Chander Azad Bharti.

[1923-1]

I, Sunny Taank S/o Vrijpal R/o # 321/C, Small Flats, Mauli Jagran, Part-2, Chandigarh-160102, have changed my name from Sunny to Sunny Taank.

[1924-1]

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

I, Bhupinder Kumar S/o Sh. Roshan Lal R/o 2083, Pipli Wala Town, Manimajra, Chandigarh, have changed my minor daughter's name from Garvi Khanna to Gayatri Khanna.

[1925-1]

I, Mohd Shakkir S/o Mohammed Tahir R/o H. No. 780/1, Sector 41-A, Chandigarh, changed my name to Mohammed Shakir.

[1926-1]

I, Priya W/o Mohammed Shakir R/o H. No. 780/1, Sector 41-A, Chandigarh, changed my name to Priya Khan.

[1927-1]

"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/ public notices will remain solely, responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc. "

160—Ptg. & Sty. Deptt., U.T., Chd.